

1957

Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall do likewise, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—31

Anderson	Jackson	Mundt
Barrett	Jenner	Murray
Bible	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Kefauver	Revercomb
Carroll	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Long	Scott
Church	Magnuson	Symington
Douglas	Malone	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Thurmond
Ellender	McClellan	
Frear	Morse	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Cooper	Hickenlooper
Allott	Cotton	Hill
Beall	Curtis	Holland
Bennett	Dirksen	Hruska
Bricker	Dworshak	Humphrey
Bush	Flanders	Ives
Capehart	Fulbright	Javits
Carlson	Gore	Johnson, Tex.
Case, N. J.	Green	Kennedy
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Knowland
Clark	Hennings	Kuchel

Lausche	Purtell	Stennis
Martin, Iowa	Robertson	Thye
Martin, Pa.	Saltonstall	Watkins
McNamara	Schoeppel	Wiley
Morton	Smith, Maine	Williams
Neuberger	Smith, N. J.	Young
Pastore	Sparkman	

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Langer	Potter
Butler	Monroney	Smathers
Ervin	Neely	Yarborough
Goldwater	Payne	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6-13-57-C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 40, line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) The President is authorized to use not to exceed \$10 million of funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section for assistance on such terms and conditions as he may specify, to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, and serving as study and demonstration centers for ideas and practices of the United States, notwithstanding any other act authorizing assistance of this kind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the amendment is permissive to the President. It does not increase the amount of the funds authorized by the bill, but merely gives authority to the President to use them for this particular purpose. As is well known, there are two or three outstanding institutions in the Middle East. For example, there is the American University at Beirut, the Robert College in Istanbul, the Pearce College just outside Athens, Greece, and the Athens College in Athens.

That type of institution would be eligible for assistance under the amendment. It is not a mandatory amendment. The President would not have to use these funds, if he did not wish to do so. However, at the present time the President does not have authority to use appropriated funds for this purpose. He does have the authority to use Public Law 480 funds for this purpose, but unfortunately, in Lebanon there are no such funds.

The chairman of the board of trustees of the American University of Beirut came before our committee and testified as to the need of these funds. I believe the evidence is quite clear that the activities of these universities are beneficial to the interests of the United States and the western idea of society as anything we are doing. I hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any precedent for this suggested activity?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is authority, as I have just stated, for the use of Public Law 480 funds, the only difference being that those funds refer to foreign currencies, whereas this amendment would permit the use of dollars. Such assistance is already being given to Robert College in Istanbul.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would this be a precedent under which other areas would be asking us to help finance their colleges where such funds would be available?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no geographical limitation under the amendment, if that is what the Senator has in mind. There is not now under existing law either. The question is whether such assistance would be beneficial to the interests of this country. There are many precedents for assistance to activities similar to that which is contemplated in the amendment. Some of them go back into the Boxer indemnity fund, which was in this general field, but not specifically limited to American students abroad. There are no additional funds required by the amendment. It gives authority for the use of funds if the administration sees fit to use them for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Throughout the day the argument has been made that the people do not understand the salutary benefits that accrue to our country through the military assistance program. My belief is that that impression of the public is rooted in the fact that we have entered many fields which to the ordinary citizen have no relationship to the defense of the country. We have two objects to obtain. The first is to help defend our country. The second is to make certain that we are offering to the citizens a program which has some semblance of acceptability.

With all due deference to the lofty motives of the Senator from Arkansas, I have the fear that a program of this type will give opponents of what we are trying to do additional fuel with which to set fire to these efforts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I must say in reply, that I regret I am unable to agree with the Senator, that military assistance is the only way in which we can contribute to the security of our country.

I believe there are many ways by which we can contribute to it. Perhaps the military way, under the situation which is developing, particularly in the light of atomic energy developments, may be one of the ways that is proving to be obsolescent. There are many ways that are more important to the future protection of the interests of this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I subscribe fully to that statement. However, there is a limitation on what we can do. If we were to explore to the limit the statement just made by the Senator, we could bring within the purview of that statement almost any activity. Certainly we cannot begin to do that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It may be desirable to have a definition of the term "community centers." What would "community centers" embrace?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that there is any community center I can think of at the moment other than the institutions I mentioned, such as the

8238

American college, as well as the other institutions, which have community centers associated with them. They would be eligible under the authority granted in the amendment.

The language in the amendment was taken from the Smith-Mundt Act, and has a history of administration. That is the reason this particular language was used. At the moment I cannot think of a particular center. As I said, however, this amendment would give the President authority to do what is contemplated; it is not mandatory, but permissive.

In the hearings we received testimony only from a representative of the university in Beirut in Lebanon, although Robert College at Istanbul is also in great need of funds, as are the other institutions. I do not, at the moment, recall what community centers are involved in the Smith-Mundt Act. I wonder whether the Senator from New Jersey can enlighten us in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot answer the question with respect to community centers. However, I call attention to the fact that we have pursued the policy of exchanging students, as the Senator knows, under the Smith-Mundt Act and under the Fulbright Act. So we have established precedents for bringing youngsters from other countries to this country, and sending our students abroad. Under those programs selections are made without regard to race or creed, and without any discrimination whatever. We have supported, as the Senator has stated, colleges like the American University at Beirut, but unfortunately there are no Public Law 480 funds available with which to assist that institution. Funds would be available under the amendment, as I understand it, for Robert College, for example.

The fund might be used for the benefit of the Chinese in the university in Formosa, for example, if it were needed in an emergency.

All those institutions, I am advised, have been taken care of by private funds or private donations, and they probably still will be. There was some need for funds for colleges in the Middle East, where funds were not available, and it was felt that some of these funds could be brought in.

I am very glad to support the Senator in this amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. My observation has been that most of the Embassies or most of the so-called American colonies in the foreign countries—it is true in Latin America—have what are called community centers. I do not think the language particularly strengthens the bill. I suggest that the author of the amendment should strike out "community centers."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator thought that was important, I would have no hesitancy in modifying my amendment by deleting those words.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the source, at least, should be defined; otherwise the language is pretty broad. If the language were stricken out, I do not think the amendment would be weakened.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not particularly what we had in mind. We took the language from the other act, in order not to make the provision too extensive, although, as the Senator well knows, the President would still have to approve this sort of program and would have to define what "community center" itself meant.

Does the Senator from South Dakota feel that the language ought to be eliminated?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment by deleting the words "community centers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has a right to modify his amendment, and it is modified accordingly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the term "abroad" make the fund applicable to schools and libraries in South America, as well as in other areas of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. I have discussed my amendment with the Senator. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to know what the Senator from Minnesota is proposing by way of modification of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the conclusion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], it is proposed to add the following:

Further, in addition to the authority contained in this subsection, it is the sense of Congress that the President should make a special and particular effort to utilize foreign currencies accruing under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, for the purposes of this subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to receiving the proposed amendment at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. It is almost identical with the language contained in the bill of last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have a little time yielded to me in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the amendment would establish a dangerous precedent. In the past, efforts have been made to provide cash grants or similar subsidies to colleges built abroad by Americans. Two years ago we put on the statute books authority whereby proceeds derived from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 could be made available to colleges abroad. Throughout the world there are a number of such colleges, some of which were established by various religious denominations.

The amendment makes no distinction between religious and nondenominational schools. A school, to be eligible for this aid, merely need be "founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, and serving as study and demonstration centers." Any school meeting that test would be entitled to the money, even if controlled or operated by a religious denomination.

I fear that if we give dollar aid to religious schools we will run afoul of the constitutional requirement requiring separation of church and state.

In addition, I think we are going just a little too far in making such funds available, because once we start such a practice, there will be no end to it. The Fulbright program is a good example.

I voted for the so-called Fulbright program authorizing the use of proceeds from the sale of surplus properties to stimulate foreign educational exchange programs. That was a very good program. But it was not long until Congress passed an act supplementing with dollars the surplus foreign currencies so realized. As a result, today we are spending more than \$30 million in dollars to assist the educational exchange program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is talking about establishing a precedent. I call his attention to section 203 of the Smith-Mundt Act, passed in 1948. I read one sentence from that act:

The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, and serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States.

That is almost identical with the language of my amendment. It is from the Smith-Mundt Act, which has been in effect since 1948. The exchange program about which the Senator is talking was passed in 1946. So there is plenty of precedent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 1946 act contemplated using proceeds derived from the sale of surplus property.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But not this.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I remind the Senator however, that besides dollars for educational exchange, we are providing vast sums for libraries operated by the Information Service. As I pointed out several days ago, we have 11 libraries in Italy which are being supported under the Information program.

1957

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8239

We have libraries in London. As a matter of fact, we have libraries all over the world.

I say, Mr. President, that here is another effort to support libraries which have been established by philanthropic societies in the United States or by persons who had money to invest abroad.

I say this is simply going too far. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have time yielded to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Ohio desire to oppose the amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, throughout the whole day the argument has been made that the moneys designated in the bill were absolutely needed as a minimum to carry out the program of the President and to insure the defense of our Country from the standpoint of mutual security.

The argument that we can take \$10 million of this money for new purposes belies the argument which has been presented throughout the day. I subscribe to the words of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Ten million dollars today will mean \$50 million 5 years from now.

If we contemplate giving this type of aid to the nations throughout the world, what answer will we give to the colleges of the United States when they ask us for money?

I stretched my judgment a bit today and yielded to the argument that we should listen to our military men, although my experience has been that they have not learned the value of the dollar. But now, at the end, we have the specter that is frightening the people of the Country being brought into the well of the Senate. It is an innocent phrase—starting a new program.

The President does not have to spend the \$10 million. It will lie within his discretion to determine whether he will do so.

Mr. President, how much pressure will be brought upon the President by various agencies to provide money? Will he yield here and yield there? What will be the picture in the Senate a year from now, when the argument will be made, "There is a deluge of applications", and when they will not be confined to those being sponsored by American citizens?

I think adoption of this amendment—innocent and appealing as it seems to be—would create the groundwork for a new program which would multiply each year.

Pardon me, Mr. President, for the fervor with which I speak on the subject; but I believe it is the responsibility of each one of us to recognize that the policy in Washington has been "Trot onto the field a new program; give it the facade of innocence, charity, and sympathy; and when once you have it in the paddock, then expect that as it moves out, you will get more and more money for it."

Mr. President, I say to you that this year Congress is passing the bill for the

mutual security program; but if activities of this type continue to be added, there will be revolt against any future programs to carry into effect activities of this type.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much time does the Senator from Minnesota wish to have yielded to him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the very appealing and moving remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I am sure every Member of the Senate has had to stretch his views and his convictions and curb his prejudices and his doubts, as he has voted on the various amendments to the mutual security bill.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to say that my gravest doubt about the mutual security bill is regarding the effectiveness of some parts of the military-assistance program. I do not refer to military assistance to the North Atlantic Alliance; I favor that. I do not even mean military assistance in Korea, where we are confronted with a visible enemy armed with modern airplanes, whereas, under the provisions of the armistice agreements, the planes we have there are not permitted to be modernized. By the way, Mr. President, I believe those armistice agreements should be reexamined, if we are to keep our commitments in that area.

Mr. President, I have refused to vote for any increase in the military-assistance program beyond what the committee favored, because I think we should keep the program in reasonable balance in light of the testimony given before the committee and the action taken by the committee. The committee action was always a compromise, Mr. President; and as a member of the committee, I have felt an obligation to go along with the program as voted for by the committee.

However, Mr. President, military assistance in some areas in the world may be much less effective today and tomorrow, and at least in the long run, than the objectives proposed in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It is one thing to have mobs on the street corners cheering the American flag on Monday, and it is another thing to have mobs tearing the American flag to pieces on Tuesday. It is one thing to give military equipment to people in the Middle East, for example, who do not even know how to use it; and it is another thing to educate the young ones, so that 10 years from now there may be serving in governments, as civil servants, persons who remember American ideals and American experiences and some of the treasures of American literature, art, and science.

If I had my choice, and if I were compelled to make a choice tonight, and if

I were compelled to cut the bill in half, it would not take me even one-half a minute to make up my mind what to do. I would throw out the military provisions; and I would choose the scientific, humanitarian, and educational provisions.

The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] authorizes the President to use not to exceed \$10 million of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section of the bill for assistance to schools and libraries. We have already authorized that program, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, last year, in the 1957 act, we directed that special emphasis be placed upon translation, books, libraries, and education. We directed that unused foreign currencies, which have piled up to the extent of \$1,800,000,000, in dollar equivalent, be used in part for education. I regret to say that very little of the money has been used for that purpose. I regret to say that in some circles of the administration, there is less enthusiasm for promoting education with this money than there is for promoting military assistance. A military-assistance program is, at best, a calculated risk, in the case of people whose effectiveness, let me say, is at times a calculated risk.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the amendment the Senator from Minnesota offered to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] supplement the provision of \$10 million, as made by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas; and does it authorize the President to have an unlimited right to use the foreign currency?

Mr. HUMPHREY. All my amendment would do, as I have offered it to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, would be to repeat to the administration what is already provided in the law, namely, that it is the sense of Congress that the Government should get busy with that program. It is only a reiteration of existing policy. But it is over and above.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It provides no limit as to the amount of money the President may use, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is over and above the use of the foreign currencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not also over and above the proceeds which may come from Public Law 480?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is out of the proceeds from Public Law 480.

Mr. ELLENDER. But are not there other currencies, outside of those generated under Public Law 480?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas uses the words "under title I of the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended."

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Minnesota know how much money is involved?

June 14

8240

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the rate of expenditure would be no more than it has been, it would be such a rate as to please the most economy-minded Member of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I refer to the amount which could be spent. As I recall, we have sold in the neighborhood of \$2 billion of surplus agricultural products under title I of Public Law 480, and approximately 90 percent of the \$2 billion in local currencies generated by the sales has been loaned back to the various buyer countries; I assume it is that money the Senator from Minnesota would like to have used in order to carry out the purposes of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; my amendment applies to the following—and I read now from the committee report, on page 27:

There is authority in Public Law 480, 83d Congress, in the Smith-Mundt Act and in the Mutual Security Act to assist these institutions through contracts for training and through loans and grants.

That authority already exists; the Senate has already voted it, and it has been in the law.

I read further from the committee report, on page 27:

The committee expects the Bureau of the Budget in carrying out its responsibilities for the allocation of Public Law 480 foreign currencies, and the Department of State in carrying out its responsibilities under the other two acts, to exert imaginative and complementary efforts to extend effective assistance to these centers of learning.

So the authorization is already in the law.

All my little amendment does is to say to the President, in effect, "Get busy and use the funds which are already there." That is what I hope to have done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that I have 1 more minute in which to conclude, inasmuch as I have an amendment of my own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota was accepted by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I will say that I trust that the amendment will be adopted, because I submit it is a sound amendment for long-term purposes which will yield effective dividends.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has been through the American University at Beirut, who has talked with the former distinguished president of it, Mr. Dodge, who was president of the university for more than 20 years, as one who has been through the Robert College in Istanbul, as one who has been through the free library founded by the Americans in Berlin, I simply wish to say that I think this discretion to the President should be permitted, and that, from

my knowledge of these three institutions alone, this is a fine amendment and should be adopted.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. Is the remaining time on both sides yielded back?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield back the time remaining to me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the time remaining to the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 37, beginning with the colon in line 20, to strike out through the word "period" in line 5 on page 38.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will ask the attention of Senators for a few moments. I shall not ask for a ye-and-nay vote on this amendment. For the past 4 or 5 years strenuous efforts have been made by the committee—

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read again? There was a good deal of noise, and I did not hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 37, beginning with the colon in line 20, to strike out through the word "period" in line 5 on page 38.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was in the process of explaining what the amendment provides. There is an appropriation, I may say to my good friend from Vermont, of \$15½ million to be used for the technical-assistance fund in the United Nations. For the past 4 or 5 years the Senate Appropriations Committee has been making a valiant fight to reduce percentagewise the amount of contribution we make to the United Nations fund in reference to technical assistance. When the U. N. was first organized, we contributed for its support in excess of 60 percent, merely to operate the organization. Over a period of about 6 years, the Appropriations Committee was able to have the contributions reduced from 60 percent to one-third.

Three or four years ago the Senate Committee on Appropriations took the same position with respect to our contribution for technical assistance. We were told 3 years ago that that should not be done at once, but should be done gradually. Two or three years passed by and no effort was made to reduce appreciably our contribution percentagewise. So last year the Appropriations

Committee wrote into the bill a provision—and it is now the law—that for 1958 the amount of contribution for technical assistance should not be more than one-third of the entire amount contributed by other nations than us.

The committee amendment seeks to nullify that law, a law which was enacted last year and in the appropriation bill, to make the contribution for the years 1958 and 1959, and on, one-third. The committee amendment provides that for 1958, instead of having the contribution percentagewise fixed as it is now by law, the contribution shall be raised to 45 percent. The following year, 1959, the contribution shall be 38 percent. Only in 1960 will the contribution go back to one-third, which is now the law.

I feel that the Senate Appropriations Committee has been very diligent, as I said, in the past 3 or 4 years in warning the State Department that we expected it to cut the contribution to one-third. As I said a while ago, it was allowed 3 or 4 years in which to attain that goal, but the Department did not do it. So last year we wrote into the law that the contribution should be one-third.

I hope I shall hear a heavy "Yea" vote for this amendment, so as to let the law remain as it is now, and provide that the United States contribution shall not be more than one-third.

If that were all we were doing in the technical aid field, I would say, good and well, we might be able to give more; but do not forget that we have provided in this very bill more than \$156 million for technical aid. We are managing that aid ourselves; we are paying for it.

We have had in the past a development assistance fund, which has been reduced this year to a loan fund. I think our contribution to the technical aid fund should certainly not be more than one-third.

I hope the Senate will at least vote for this amendment, so as to sustain the action it took last year in providing that the amount shall be not more than one-third.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is a good deal of merit in what the Senator from Louisiana has just said, and he has been quite accurate. It is true the Congress last year did decree that beginning with calendar year 1958, which starts next January, the amount of our contribution, on a percentage basis, to the U. N. technical-assistance fund should be 33⅓ percent.

However, after deliberations within the Committee on Foreign Relations, it was decided, on the basis of evidence presented to us, that the drop from 49 percent to 33⅓ percent in 1 year would be entirely too great.

I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana, that insofar as I can recall, every member of the Foreign Relations Committee was and is in accord with the objective, but we felt, in this vital cooperative program, it would be too much of a break to drop from 49 to 33⅓ percent in 1 year, and on the basis of an amendment offered in the committee, we decided to try it out in 3 gradual stages.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana, who has been entirely truthful and con-